

We know that business is complaining, that enterprise is complaining about being overregulated. We also know it is complaining about being overtaxed. Today we are going to try to do something for Americans who are overtaxed. We are going to try and send a budget forward that says that we recognize we are taxing too much, and now is the time that we can afford to do all the things government should appropriately and properly do for Americans in need who are counting on those programs, and we will still have the ability to reduce taxes on hard-working Americans so they can save and spend their own money instead of having us do it for them in Washington.

I think one of the questions we have to ask regularly when we are talking about the Federal budget is, is the expenditure that is being considered appropriate for the Federal Government, or are there other ways to spend money? Because when we get into questions of spending Federal dollars, what we are really asking is who pays and how much.

We know the answer to who pays: It is the taxpayers. How much? We know the answer to that now in America, too. We are taxing too much.

I urge my colleagues to pay close attention to the debate today. We have put good debate potential on the floor under this rule. I urge support of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 282, nays 130, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]

YEAS—282

Abercrombie	Bilirakis	Camp
Aderholt	Bishop	Cannon
Akin	Blunt	Cantor
Armey	Boehliert	Capito
Baca	Boehner	Capps
Bachus	Bonilla	Cardin
Baird	Bonior	Chabot
Baker	Bono	Chambliss
Ballenger	Borski	Clement
Barcia	Boswell	Coble
Barr	Boucher	Collins
Barrett	Brady (PA)	Combest
Bartlett	Brady (TX)	Cooksey
Barton	Brown (SC)	Cramer
Bass	Bryant	Crane
Bereuter	Burr	Crenshaw
Berkley	Buyer	Crowley
Biggert	Calvert	Cubin

Culberson	Isakson	Putnam
Cummings	Israel	Quinn
Cunningham	Issa	Rahall
Davis (CA)	Istook	Ramstad
Davis, Jo Ann	Jenkins	Regula
Davis, Tom	Johnson (CT)	Rehberg
Deal	Johnson (IL)	Riley
DeLauro	Johnson, Sam	Rivers
DeLay	Jones (NC)	Rodriguez
DeMint	Keller	Roemer
Diaz-Balart	Kelly	Rogers (KY)
Dingell	Kennedy (MN)	Rogers (MI)
Doggett	Kerns	Rohrabacher
Dooley	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Doolittle	Kingston	Roukema
Doyle	Kirk	Royce
Dreier	Knollenberg	Ryan (WI)
Duncan	Kolbe	Ryun (KS)
Dunn	Kucinich	Saxton
Ehlers	LaHood	Scarborough
Ehrlich	Lantos	Schaffer
Emerson	Largent	Schrock
Engel	Larsen (WA)	Sensenbrenner
English	Larson (CT)	Sessions
Eshoo	Latham	Shadeeg
Etheridge	LaTourrette	Shays
Everett	Leach	Sherwood
Ferguson	Lewis (CA)	Shimkus
Flake	Lewis (KY)	Shows
Fletcher	Linder	Simmons
Foley	LoBiondo	Simpson
Ford	Lucas (KY)	Skeen
Fossella	Lucas (OK)	Skelton
Frelinghuysen	Maloney (NY)	Smith (MI)
Frost	Manzullo	Smith (NJ)
Galleghy	Mascara	Smith (TX)
Ganske	Matheson	Smith (WA)
Gekas	Matsui	Snyder
Gibbons	McCarthy (MO)	Souder
Gilchrest	McCrery	Spence
Gillmor	McHugh	Stearns
Gilman	McInnis	Stenholm
Gonzalez	McKeon	Strickland
Goode	Menendez	Stump
Goodlatte	Mica	Sununu
Goss	Miller (FL)	Sweeney
Graham	Miller, Gary	Tancredo
Granger	Moore	Tauzin
Graves	Moran (KS)	Taylor (MS)
Green (WI)	Morella	Taylor (NC)
Greenwood	Murtha	Terry
Grucci	Myrick	Thomas
Gutknecht	Nethercutt	Thompson (CA)
Hall (OH)	Ney	Thornberry
Hall (TX)	Northup	Thune
Hansen	Norwood	Tiahrt
Hart	Nussle	Tiberi
Hastings (WA)	Ortiz	Toomey
Hayes	Osborne	Trafficant
Hayworth	Ose	Turner
Hefley	Otter	Upton
Herger	Oxley	Vitter
Hill	Pascarell	Walden
Hilleary	Pastor	Walsh
Hinojosa	Paul	Wamp
Hobson	Pence	Watkins
Hoekstra	Peterson (PA)	Watts (OK)
Holden	Petri	Weldon (FL)
Horn	Phelps	Weldon (PA)
Hostettler	Pickering	Weller
Houghton	Pitts	Whitfield
Hulshof	Platts	Wicker
Hunter	Pombo	Wilson
Hutchinson	Pomeroy	Wolf
Hyde	Portman	Wynn
Inslee	Pryce (OH)	Young (FL)

NAYS—130

Ackerman	Clyburn	Frank
Allen	Condit	Gephardt
Andrews	Conyers	Green (TX)
Baldacci	Costello	Gutierrez
Bentsen	Coyne	Harman
Berman	Davis (FL)	Hastings (FL)
Berry	Davis (IL)	Hilliard
Blagojevich	DeFazio	Hinchee
Blumenauer	DeGette	Hoeffel
Brown (FL)	Delahunt	Holt
Brown (OH)	Deutsch	Honda
Capuano	Dicks	Hooley
Carson (IN)	Edwards	Hoyer
Carson (OK)	Evans	Jackson (IL)
Castle	Farr	Jackson-Lee
Clay	Fattah	(TX)
Clayton	Filner	Jefferson

John	Meeks (NY)	Schakowsky
Johnson, E. B.	Millender-	Schiff
Jones (OH)	McDonald	Scott
Kanjorski	Miller, George	Serrano
Kennedy (RI)	Moakley	Sherman
Kildee	Mollohan	Slaughter
Kilpatrick	Moran (VA)	Solis
Kind (WI)	Nadler	Spratt
LaFalce	Napolitano	Stark
Langevin	Neal	Stupak
Lee	Oberstar	Tanner
Levin	Obey	Tauscher
Lewis (GA)	Olver	Thompson (MS)
Lipinski	Owens	Thurman
Lofgren	Pallone	Tierney
Lowey	Payne	Towns
Luther	Pelosi	Udall (CO)
Maloney (CT)	Peterson (MN)	Udall (NM)
Markey	Price (NC)	Velázquez
McCarthy (NY)	Ross	Visclosky
McCollum	Roybal-Allard	Waters
McDermott	Rush	Watt (NC)
McGovern	Sabo	Waxman
McIntyre	Sanchez	Weiner
McNulty	Sanders	Wexler
Meehan	Sandlin	Woolsey
Meek (FL)	Sawyer	Wu

NOT VOTING—20

Baldwin	Kaptur	Reyes
Becerra	Klecza	Reynolds
Boyd	Lampson	Rothman
Burton	McKinney	Shaw
Callahan	Mink	Sisisky
Cox	Radanovich	Young (AK)
Gordon	Rangel	

□ 1030

Messrs. BENTSEN, ALLEN, KIND, SAWYER, EDWARDS, LUTHER, and OWENS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. RIVERS, Mr. TAUZIN and Mr. KUCINICH changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADOPTION OF FURTHER AMENDMENT TO H. CON. RES. 83, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration of H. Con. Res. 83, pursuant to House Resolution 100, the further amendment that I have placed at the desk be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole; and that the amendment I have placed at the desk be considered as read for the purpose of this request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 26, strike “\$2,378,000,000,000” and insert “\$2,387,000,000,000”.

Page 3, line 4, strike “\$5,800,000,000,000” and insert “\$5,800,000,000”.

Page 5, line 14, strike “\$5,903,000,000,000” and insert “\$5,875,000,000,000”.

Page 5, line 15, strike “\$6,394,000,000,000” and insert “\$5,928,000,000,000”.

Page 5, line 16, strike “\$6,972,000,000,000” and insert “\$5,969,000,000,000”.

Page 5, line 17, strike “\$7,596,000,000,000” and insert “\$5,988,000,000,000”.

Page 5, line 18, strike "\$3,623,000,000,000" and insert "\$6,344,000,000,000".

Page 5, line 19, strike "\$9,436,000,000,000" and insert "\$6,721,000,000,000".

Page 13, line 11, strike "\$28,000,000,000" and insert "\$28,800,000,000".

Page 19, line 20, strike "cal" and insert "fiscal".

Page 43, move lines 4 through 13 two ems to the left.

Page 44, line 6, strike "\$153,000,000" and insert "\$153,000,000,000".

Page 46, line 10, "\$3,871,000" and insert "\$3,871,000,000".

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 100 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 83.

□ 1032

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011, with Mr. LATOURETTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution is considered as having been read the first time.

The period of debate on the subject of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2002 that occurred on March 27, 2001, pursuant to the order of the House of March 22, 2001, shall be considered to have been debated on House Concurrent Resolution 83, and the time for debate prescribed in section 305 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall be considered to have expired.

A further period of general debate shall be confined to the concurrent resolution and shall not exceed 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes for the purpose of opening the debate.

Mr. Chairman, good morning. We are in the midst of continuing the debate

on the budget for fiscal year 2002, and let me review what our plan has in store. We wrote a budget that has six principles that we think are pretty important as we stand on this very important threshold of the 21st century.

In our budget, we have maximum debt elimination, a historic \$2.3 trillion of paying down the public debt by 2011 during this 10-year period.

Tax relief for every American taxpayer: \$1,600 on average income tax break for the average family of four.

Improved education for our children: \$44.5 billion commitment in fiscal year 2002 alone, an 11.5 percent increase for our kids. But we also recognize that it is not just the money, it is also reform of education.

A stronger national defense is our fourth principle: \$14 billion increase, not only in 2001, but a \$5.7 billion increase for pay, housing, and health care in 2002.

Health care reform that modernizes Medicare, provides for a prescription-drug benefit. It modernizes our Medicare benefit, because it is not just about the current Medicare and the current trust fund, it is about extending the life of the trust fund, extending the solvency through modernization. It is not a zero-sum game as some of my friends on the other side would have it.

Finally, saving Social Security. Third year in a row, the Republicans are setting aside all of the Social Security trust fund for exactly what we pay the FICA taxes for, for Social Security, for the retirement of our seniors. It is totally protected in this budget.

We have a good plan. These are the six principles that make up the plan.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, to talk about improved education for our children.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to stand before the House this morning in support of a budget blueprint that represents America's families and America's priorities.

Our colleagues on the Committee on the Budget have presented us with a common sense plan to improve education, strengthen the economy, and secure America's future. It reflects President Bush's efforts to close the achievement gap in education between disadvantaged students and their peers, and to work with States to push America's schools to be the best in the world.

Despite a decade of economic growth in the 1990s, the achievement gap between students, Anglo and minority, remains very wide. Washington has spent more than \$130 billion since 1965 in a well-intentioned effort to close

this gap. We spent more than \$80 billion on that goal since 1990 alone; and, unfortunately, those efforts have not worked. Nearly 70 percent of inner city and rural fourth graders cannot read on a basic level, and low-income students lag behind their counterparts by an average of 20 percentile points on national assessment tests.

The hard lesson of the last 35 years is that money alone cannot be the vehicle for change in our public schools. There must also be accountability.

To ensure that Federal education dollars are being used effectively, we must ask States to assess student achievement in academics. One cannot correct a problem if one does not know that it exists; and for far too long, we have been spending Federal tax dollars in education without being able to track our students' progress and make certain that they are learning.

The budget before us today provides a framework for the most important change in Federal education policy since President Johnson. It paves the way for us to rededicate the Federal role in education to helping students who might otherwise fall through the cracks. It provides the resources needed to implement a system of accountability so parents will be able to know whether their children are learning.

This budget provides the resources necessary to accomplish these bold goals. It provides money to States to develop the test to track student performance each year, the centerpiece of the President's plan to leave no child behind. It targets resources to those who need it most by providing substantial funding for title I which provides aid to low-income students. Federal education funding for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the principle Federal law to aid disadvantaged students, is increased significantly.

Funding for reading programs is tripled, increasing to \$5 billion over 5 years. This program will help reduce the number of children placed in special-education classes simply because they have not learned to read, moving the Federal Government closer to its original promise of providing up to 40 percent of the average per-pupil expenditures in IDEA to the States.

This budget also provides \$2.6 billion for States to improve teacher quality through high-quality professional development, recruitment, and retention activities.

It addresses other educational priorities as well in higher education. An additional \$1 billion is included for Pell Grants, increasing the maximum award for all students to provide more need-based grant aid to low-income college students.

Mr. Chairman, until we have a real system of accountability in place, it is truly unfair to our children to enact massive increases in Federal education